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SUMMARY

The results of the power-off wind-tunnel tests of a 1/11-scale model of a twin-engine cargo airplane equipped with wheel skis are presented. Longitudinal-, directional-, and lateral-stability characteristics were investigated for two flap positions and three ski positions. The effect on the drag coefficient of fairing the main skis in the retracted position was also investigated.

The test results indicated that the longitudinal-, directional-, and lateral-stability characteristics in pitch and yaw were practically unchanged by the addition of the wheel skis. At a lift coefficient of 0.2 (high-speed condition), the measured drag increment due to the main skis in the retracted position was 0.0017. This value was reduced to 0.0005 when fairings were added between the main skis and the nacelles. The measured drag increment of the tail ski was 0.0005.

INTRODUCTION

At the request of the Air Technical Service Command, tests on a 1/11-scale model of a twin-engine cargo airplane equipped with wheel skis were conducted in the Ames 7-by-10-foot wind tunnel. A three-view drawing of the airplane is presented in figure 1. The purpose of these tests was to investigate the effect of wheel skis on
power-off longitudinal-, directional-, and lateral-stability characteristics of the model and to investigate the effect on the drag of fairing the main skis in the retracted position.

Pitch and yaw runs were made with the model in the skis-off condition at two flap positions and with retracted and extended main landing gear as a measure for comparison with the skis-on runs. With the model in the skis-on condition, runs were made with the main skis and gear retracted, extended for landing on a hard surface, and extended for landing on snow. For these runs, the tail ski and gear were always in a fixed position as the tail wheel is non-retractable. Figure 2 shows detail drawings of the ski positions tested.

The tests were conducted during the period of December 16 to December 19, 1944, inclusive. All data included have been presented previously in preliminary form.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL AND THE AIRPLANE

A 1/5-scale model of a twin-engine cargo airplane of conventional design was used in the tests. The model configuration symbols employed are listed in Appendix A and the full-scale dimensions of the airplane are presented in table I. Photographs of the model mounted in the tunnel with the main landing gear and skis retracted, gear and skis extended for landing on a hard runway, and with gear and skis extended for snow landing are shown in figures 3, 4, and 5, respectively.

COEFFICIENTS AND CORRECTIONS

All data are presented as standard NACA coefficients and are corrected for tarps, tunnel-wall interference, and stream inclination. All coefficients are referred to the wind axes except when the model is yawed. In the latter case, the force coefficients $C_D'$ and $C_Y'$ and the moment coefficients $C_m'$ and $C_l'$ are given about the stability axes. The coefficients used are defined as follows:
C_L lift coefficient \( \left( \frac{\text{lift}}{qS} \right) \)
C_D drag coefficient \( \left( \frac{\text{drag}}{qS} \right) \)
C_D' drag coefficient about the stability axes \( \left( \frac{\text{drag}}{qS} \right) \)
C_Y' lateral-force coefficient about the stability axes \( \left( \frac{\text{lateral force}}{qS} \right) \)
C_m pitching moment \( \left( \frac{\text{pitching moment}}{qS} \right) \)
C_m' pitching-moment coefficient about the stability axes \( \left( \frac{\text{pitching moment}}{qS} \right) \)
C_n yawing-moment coefficient \( \left( \frac{\text{yawing moment}}{qSb} \right) \)
C_L' rolling-moment coefficient about the stability axes \( \left( \frac{\text{rolling moment}}{qSb} \right) \)
C_Dp parasite drag coefficient \( \left( C_D - \frac{C_L^2}{\pi A} \right) \)

where
q dynamic pressure \( \left( \frac{1}{2} \rho V^2 \right) \)
S wing area, square feet
\( \bar{c} \) wing mean aerodynamic chord (M.A.C.), feet
b wing span, feet
A wing aspect ratio \( \left( \frac{b^2}{S} \right) \)

Moment coefficients are presented about a center of gravity located at 20.8 percent of the mean aerodynamic chord and 2.7 percent of the mean aerodynamic chord below the thrust line. This is the same reference center of gravity used in reference 1. A line diagram of the reference center-of-gravity location is presented in figure 6.
The angle of attack is measured from the fuselage reference line and the angle of yaw from the plane of symmetry.

A dynamic pressure of 50 pounds per square foot corresponding to a Reynolds number (based on the wing M.A.C.) of 1,300,000 was maintained for all tests.

The stream inclination and tare corrections used in the computations are the same as those used in obtaining the results of reference 1. Definitions of the tunnel-wall corrections may be found in Appendix B.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The effect of wheel skis on the longitudinal characteristics at zero yaw is shown in figure 7 for flaps up and down 45°, with the main landing gear retracted. Figure 8 presents, for the flaps-up condition, the effect of the skis on the longitudinal characteristics of the model with the main landing gear extended, and the condition with flaps down at 45° is shown in figure 9. These figures indicated that the addition of the wheel skis had negligible effect on the longitudinal-stability and lift characteristics.

The effect of the skis on the characteristics of the model in yaw at $\alpha_u = -10^\circ$ and $6^\circ$, with flaps up and main landing gear retracted, is presented in figures 10 and 11. The characteristics at $\alpha_u = 5^\circ$, with flaps down 45° and main landing gear extended, are shown in figures 12 and 13 ($\alpha_u$, the uncorrected angle of attack referred to the fuselage reference line in degrees). The longitudinal-, directional-, and lateral-stability characteristics of the model in yaw are practically unchanged by the addition of the wheel skis.

The drag coefficient is found to be reduced when the skis in the retracted position are added to the model with flaps down at 45°. (See fig. 7.) However, in the flaps-up condition, a high-speed profile-drag increment (at $C_L = 0.2$) of $\Delta C_D = 0.0022$ resulted from the addition of the tail ski and the main skis to the retracted landing gear. (See fig. 14.) The fairing of the main skis in the retracted position with model clay, as shown in figure 15, greatly reduced the over-all drag increment to $\Delta C_D = 0.0010$. By removing the tail ski, the drag increment of the faired main
skis alone (in the retracted position) is found to be \( \Delta C_{DP} = 0.0005 \). Hence, the drag increment of the tail ski is also \( \Delta C_{DP} = 0.0005 \).

**CONCLUSIONS**

The conclusions drawn from the tests of the 1/11-scale model of the twin-engine cargo airplane equipped with wheel skis are as follows:

1. The addition of the wheel skis had a negligible effect on the power-off stability characteristics of the model in pitch and in yaw.

2. At \( C_L = 0.2 \), the profile-drag increment due to the main skis in the retracted position is 0.0017, while that of the tail ski is 0.0005. The fairing of the main skis in the retracted position with model clay reduces the drag increment to 0.0005.
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**APPENDIX A**

**MODEL CONFIGURATION KEY**

| W  | wing   |
| B  | fuselage |
| N  | nacelles |
| E  | exhaust stacks |
| H  | horizontal tail |
| V  | vertical tail |
| F  | flaps |
L  main landing gear extended
L_R  main landing gear retracted
L_T  tail wheel
L_1  front gear extended, front skis extended
L_2  front gear extended, front skis retracted
L_3  front gear retracted, front skis retracted
L_3' front gear retracted, front skis retracted plus ski fairings
L_4  tail wheel plus tail ski
S  standard configuration, \( \text{WB} \text{NEL}_{L_T} \text{HV} \)

APPENDIX B

TUNNEL-WALL CORRECTIONS

The tunnel-wall corrections are defined as follows:

\[
\Delta \alpha = (\delta_w + 0.017c) \frac{3}{6} C_L \times 57.3 = 0.94 C_L
\]

\[
\Delta C_D = \frac{\delta_w C_L^2 S}{70} = 0.0143 C_L^2
\]

\[
\Delta C_m = -\delta_t \frac{S C_L}{c} \frac{dCm_t}{dt} \times 57.3 = -0.019 C_L
\]

where

\( \Delta \alpha \)  tunnel-wall correction to angle of attack, deg
\( \Delta C_D \)  tunnel-wall correction to drag coefficient
\( \Delta C_m \)  tunnel-wall correction to pitching-moment coefficient
\( \delta_w \)  jet-boundary correction factor at the wing = 0.1235
\( \delta_t \)  jet-boundary correction factor at the tail = 0.087
\[
\frac{dC_{mt}}{d\theta} \quad \text{change in pitching moment per degree change in stabilizer angle (stabilizer effectiveness)} = -0.033/\text{deg (computed)}
\]

\begin{align*}
C & \quad \text{tunnel cross-section area} = 70 \text{ sq ft} \\
S & \quad \text{wing area} = 8.16 \text{ sq ft} \\
\bar{c} & \quad \text{mean aerodynamic chord} = 1.05 \text{ ft}
\end{align*}

Model dimensions used in computing coefficients are as follows:

- Wing area, sq ft: 8.16
- Wing span, ft: 8.60
- Wing mean aerodynamic chord, ft: 1.05
- Wing aspect ratio: 9.06
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TABLE I.- GEOMETRIC DATA OF TWIN-ENGINE CARGO AIRPLANE

[Dimensions are full scale]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Wing</th>
<th>Horizontal tail</th>
<th>Vertical tail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>967 ft²</td>
<td>206.5 ft²</td>
<td>110.2 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span</td>
<td>94.58 ft</td>
<td>26.7 ft</td>
<td>11.23 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect ratio</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.C.</td>
<td>11.52 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flap (type)</td>
<td>split</td>
<td>simple (balanced)</td>
<td>simple (balanced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACA section</td>
<td>2215 root</td>
<td>modified</td>
<td>modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taper ratio</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence</td>
<td>2°</td>
<td>2°</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Elevator</th>
<th>Rudder</th>
<th>Flap (Split)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area aft hinge Span</td>
<td>62.2 ft²</td>
<td>35.8 ft²</td>
<td>83.5 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total surface area affected</td>
<td>26.7 ft</td>
<td>9.26 ft</td>
<td>41.5 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord</td>
<td>176.6 ft²</td>
<td>84.0 ft²</td>
<td>552 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(constant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length from c.g. to elevator hinge line, \( l_H = 39.7 \) ft.
Length from c.g. to rudder hinge line, \( l_V = 38.3 \) ft.
FIGURE 1. — THREE-VIEW DRAWING OF THE TWIN-ENGINE CARGO AIRPLANE EQUIPPED WITH WHEEL SKIS.
NOTE: ALL SKI ANGLES TAKEN ON TOP OF SKI BULKHEAD.

2° POSITIVE INCIDENCE WITH RESPECT TO AIRPLANE THRUST LINE.

GEAR EXTENDED AND SKIS EXTENDED FOR LANDING ON SNOW ~ CONFIG. = L1

4° NEGATIVE INCIDENCE WITH RESPECT TO AIRPLANE THRUST LINE.

GEAR EXTENDED AND SKIS RETRACTED FOR LANDING ON HARD RUNWAY

Config. = L2

6° SKI PIVOT (RADIUS = 1.33" FROM WHEEL CENTER)

GEAR RETRACTED AND SKIS RETRACTED ~ CONFIG. = L3

8° TAIL SKI PIVOT COINCIDENT WITH WHEEL CENTER.

3° POSITIVE INCIDENCE WITH RESPECT TO AIRPLANE THRUST LINE.

TAIL SKI AT FIXED POSITION ~ CONFIG. = L4

Figure 2: Wheel-ski positions tested on a 1/6-scale model of the twin-engine cargo airplane.
Figure 3.- The 1/11-scale model of the twin-engine cargo airplane showing the skis and gear retracted (S+L₉L₆+Faskan).
Figure 4.-- The 1/11-scale model of the twin-engine cargo airplane showing skis and gear extended for landing on a hard runway (S2L2L4+F45).
Figure 6.- The 1/11-scale model of the twin-engine cargo airplane showing skis and gear extended for landing on snow (\(a + \theta_1 L_2 + \theta_2^2\)).
Figure 6. - Center-of-Gravity Location for the Twin-Engine Cargo Airplane.
FIGURE 7: EFFECT OF WHEEL SKIS ON LONGITUDINAL-STABILITY
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MODEL AT ZERO YAW,
FLAPS UP AND DOWN 45°, MAIN LANDING GEAR RETRACTED,
RUDDER AND ELEVATOR NEUTRAL.
FIGURE 8.- EFFECT OF WHEEL SKIS ON LONGITUDINAL STABILITY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MODEL AT ZERO YAW, FLAPS UP, MAIN LANDING GEAR EXTENDED, RUDDER AND ELEVATOR NEUTRAL.
FIGURE 9. - EFFECT OF WHEEL SKIS ON LONGITUDINAL-STABILITY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MODEL AT ZERO YAW, FLAPS AT 45°, MAIN LANDING GEAR EXTENDED, RUDDER AND ELEVATOR NEUTRAL.
Figure 10. Effect of wheel skis on $C_L$, $C_D$, and $C_m$.
Model at $\alpha = -1'$ and $6'$, flaps up, main landing gear retracted, rudder and elevator neutral.
FIGURE 11. - EFFECT OF WHEEL SKIS ON LATERAL-STABILITY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MODEL AT $\alpha_{u} = -1^\circ$ AND $6^\circ$. $C_L^{\infty} = 0.25$ AND $0.9$, FLAPS UP, MAIN LANDING GEAR RETRACTED, RUDDER AND ELEVATOR NEUTRAL.
FIGURE 12.- EFFECT OF WHEEL SKIS ON $C_L$, $C_D'$, AND $C_m'$;
MODEL AT $C_D = 6^\circ$, FLAPS DOWN 45°, MAIN LANDING GEAR EXTENDED,
Rudder and Elevator Neutral.
FIGURE 18 - EFFECT OF WHEEL SKIS ON LATERAL-STABILITY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MODEL AT \( \alpha_0 = 6^\circ \), FLAPS DOWN 45\(^\circ\), \( C_L \approx 1.4 \), MAIN LANDING GEAR EXTENDED, RUDDER AND ELEVATOR NEUTRAL.
FIGURE 14.—MINIMUM DRAG CHARACTERISTICS OF
THE MODEL WITH THE MAIN WHEEL
SkiS ON AND OFF, TAIl WHEEL SKI ON AND
OFF, WITH AND WITHOUT SKI FAIRINGS,
FLAPS UP.
Figure 15—The 1/11-scale model of the twin-engine cargo airplane showing the main skis in the retracted position with a clay fairing added.